

REMARKS

This is a complete and timely response to the Final Office Action mailed November 22, 2006. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 4-7 and 15-20 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 3 and 8-14 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is added. In light of the foregoing amendment and following remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

I. Applicant's Election

Applicant acknowledges the finality of the election requirement mailed March 24, 2006. Claims 9-14 have been canceled. Applicant reaffirms the election to prosecute the claims of Group I (claims 1-8). As shown in the above list of claims, claims 4-7 and 15-20 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1.

Applicant agrees that claim 1 is generic to the elected species.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging that the subject matter illustrated in each of figures 5A-5D and 6-9 are Sub-Species of Species I (i.e., the elected species).

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1, 4-8 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the claims are unclear and confusing as to what is meant by "wherein the substrate is selectively flip-chip coupled via bond pads on the substrate such that the matching circuit is interposed between the optoelectronic device and the driver."

B. Discussion of the Rejection

Claim 8 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 is rendered moot.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, includes "a driver formed separate from the substrate, the driver configured to control the optoelectronic device within a desired frequency range, wherein the substrate is selectively flip-chip coupled to the driver via bond pads on the substrate such that the matching circuit is interposed between the optoelectronic device and the driver."

FIG. 4 illustrates an example embodiment of the apparatus of claim 1. FIG. 4 illustrates both a first and a second substrate. FIG. 4 shows substrate 403 with matching circuit 405 and optoelectronic device 401. Matching circuit 405 is coupled to optoelectronic device 401. Driver 407 is shown separate from and coupled to substrate 403 via bond pads such that the matching circuit 405 is interposed between the optoelectronic device 401 and the driver 407.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is definite, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 4-7 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 4-7 and 15-20 are allowable and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any comments regarding the Applicant's response, Applicant requests that the Examiner telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

**SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPTEL
GREENLEE BLAHA LLC**

By: /Robert A. Blaha/
Robert A. Blaha
Registration No. 43,502
(770) 709-0069